



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,899	10/10/2001	Hannu Toyryla	P 283782 2010638US/Ka/kp	4459
909	7590	11/17/2004	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102			CUMMING, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/972,899

Applicant(s)

HANNU TORYLA

Examiner

WILLIAM D CUMMING

Art Unit

2683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by **Maggenti, et al** as stated in paragraph 2 of the Office action dated May 14, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Maggenti, et al** in view of **Yarwood** as stated by paragraph 4 in the Office action dated May 14, 2004.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed August 16, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding arguments on page 1, anticipatory reference need not duplicate, word for word, what is in claims; anticipation can occur when claimed limitation is "*inherent*" or otherwise implicit in relevant reference (Standard Havens Products Incorporated v. Gencor Industries Incorporated, 21 USPQ2d 1321). During examination before the Patent and Trademark Office, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and limitations from the specification may not be imputed to the claims (Ex parte Akamatsu, 22 USPQ2d, 1918; In re Zletz, 13 USPQ2d 1320, In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11). In response to Applicant's argument, the law of anticipation requires that a distinction be made between the invention described or taught and the invention claimed. It does not require that the reference "*teach*" what the subject patent teaches. Assuming that a reference is properly "*prior art*," it is only necessary that the claims under consideration "*read on*" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference, or "*fully met*" by it. It was held in In re Donohue, 226 USPQ 619, that, "*It is well settled that prior art under 35 USC §102(b) must sufficiently describe the claimed invention to have placed the public in possession of it...Such possession is effected if one of ordinary skill in the art could have combine the description of the invention with his own knowledge to make the claimed invention.*" Clear inference to the artisan must

be considered, In re Preda, 159 USPQ 342. A prior art reference must be considered together with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, In re Samour, 197 USPQ 1. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "*given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.*" Claim term is not limited to single embodiment disclosed in specification, since number of embodiments disclosed does not determine meaning of the claim term, and applicant cannot overcome "*heavy presumption*" that term takes on its ordinary meaning simply by pointing to preferred embodiment (*Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp.*, CA FC, 6/21/02, 63 USPQ2d 1374). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA1969). "*Arguments that the alleged anticipatory prior art is nonanalogous art' or teaches away from the invention' or is not recognized as solving the problem solved by the claimed invention, [are] not germane' to a rejection under section 102.*" *Twin Disc, Inc. v. United States*, 231 USPQ 417, 424 (Cl. Ct. 1986) (quoting *In re Self*, 671 F.2d 1344, 213 USPQ 1, 7 (CCPA 1982)). A reference is no less anticipatory if, after disclosing the invention, the reference then disparages it. The question whether a reference "*teaches away*" from the invention is inapplicable to an anticipation analysis. *Celeritas Technologies Ltd.*

v. Rockwell International Corp., 150 F.3d 1354, 1361, 47 USPQ2d 1516, 1522-23 (Fed. Cir.1998).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., making it possible in the radio network to recognize not only single streams, but also which streams belong to the same group and which enables resources to be efficiently utilized even when only one group is involved and two different groups in a particular cell can be served separately with a single respective channel) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The specification is not the measure of the invention. Therefore, limitations contained therein can not be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art (*In re Sporck*, 155 USPQ 687). Attempt to invoke limitations present in the preferred embodiment but absent from the claims themselves violates the established claim construction principles

"Radio resources" can mean a single channel to multiple channels, a single frequency to multiple frequencies, a single data format to multiple data format, etc. If applicants claim their invention in very broad terms, then it should not come to surprise that the examiner also examines the claims just as broadly.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.
9. **Replacement Notice: Copies of Patent Application Records will be Provided in both Electronic and Paper Form**
- The Official Gazette notice, published on August 24, 2004 entitled "*All Electronic Copies of Patent Application Records Will Now Be Provided as Certified Copies in Electronic Form*" (1285 Off. Gaz. Pat. Off, August 24, 2004) is hereby rescinded. The USPTO is reinstating, until further notice, the procedures in effect prior to July 30, 2004 for providing certified copies of patent application records with paper certification statements. The USPTO will also offer electronic certified copies of patent application records at the requester's option.
- Certified Copies with Paper Certification**
- Unless otherwise requested, certified copies of patent application records provided pursuant to 37 CFR 1.19 (b) will be produced with a paper certification statement, continuing the practice in effect prior to July 30, 2004. The certification statement will include an embossed seal and original signature.
- Certified Copies with Electronic Certification**
- Customers ordering certified copies of patent applications as filed or patent-related file wrapper and contents of published applications from the

USPTO website will have the option to choose electronic copies with electronic certification. These files include an imaged certification statement as part of a PDF file containing the document TIFF images. These electronic files are digitally signed by the USPTO for authenticity and integrity, and cannot be undetectably modified. Customers may choose to download these electronic files from the USPTO website or receive them on compact disc.

Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and Priority

Irrespective of whether the USPTO provides a paper certified copy or an *electronic certified copy*, Article 4(d)(3) of the *Paris Convention* prohibits any country that is a member of the convention from requiring further authentication of the certified copy for purposes of claiming priority under the Paris Convention. (The text of the Paris Convention and a list of its members are available at www.wipo.int/treaties/en/ip/paris/index.html.)

The USPTO is working with other intellectual property offices to encourage the acceptance of priority documents in electronic form with electronic certification. A list of offices and international intellectual property organizations that have agreed to accept electronic certified copies will be posted on the USPTO website soon, and updated regularly.

Questions should be directed to the Office of Public Records by email to opr@uspto.gov or by telephone at (703) 308-9743.

10. If applicants wish to request for an interview, an "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form (PTOL-413A) should be submitted to the examiner prior to the interview in order to permit the examiner to prepare in advance for the interview and to focus on the issues to be discussed. This form should identify the participants of the interview, the proposed date of the interview, whether the interview will be personal, telephonic, or video conference, and should include a brief description of the issues to be discussed. A copy of the completed "*Applicant Initiated Interview Request*" form should be attached to the Interview Summary form, PTOL-413 at the completion of the interview and a copy should be given to applicant or applicant's representative.

11. If applicants request an interview after this **final rejection**, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, in writing.

Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accomplished with only nominal further consideration.

Interviews merely to **restate arguments** of record or to **discuss new limitations** which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search will be denied.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **WILLIAM D CUMMING** whose telephone number is 703-305-4394. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday 10:30am to 8:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **WILLIAM TROST** can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wdc



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

William Cumming
Primary Patent Examiner
(703) 305-4394
(703) 746-6075 Fax
william.cumming@uspto.gov


WILLIAM CUMMING
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2600